



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/495,799	02/01/2000	Christian A. Gilmore	1999-0225	5305

7590 02/13/2007
Samuel H Dworetsky
AT&T Corp
P O Box 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. The instant application claims priority to the U.S. Provisional Application S/N 60/173,979, filed on 30-December-1999. Accordingly, the filing date of the Provisional Patent Application (30-December-1999) is considered the effective filing date for the examination of the instant application.

Remarks

2. In response to communications filed on 13-November-2006, claims 1-2, 7, 11, and 23 are amended per applicant's request. Claims 1-23 are presently pending in the application, of which, claims 1, 11 and 23 are presented in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 23 *remains* rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 23 recites the limitation “through which said proxy *can forward* requests to said client to said second proxy”, which renders the above “*method*” claims indefinite. The limitation “*can forward*” implies “configuration” or “system ability” (for example, “the first proxy is configured to forward requests”), which is acceptable for a “system” or an “apparatus” claim. However, in a “method” claim, functional limitations need to be definitive. It is not clear from the above claims as to whether or not the limitation of “forwarding” (the requests) is necessarily a required functional part of the claims. This rejection can be overcome by amending the independent claims to recite the above limitations in a definitive form (e.g., “through which said proxy *forwards* requests to said client to said second proxy”).

Note: The Applicant amended claim 1 in the previous Reply to overcome the same rejection but left the recitation unchanged for claim 23.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that said subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brownell** in view of **Smith et al** (U.S. Patent No. 6,578,078 B1, hereinafter referred to as **Smith**.)

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 11, **Brownell** teaches a method comprising the steps of:

a proxy enabled to access resources behind the firewall (see figure 3, where “proxy” is read on “Tunnel 341); and

transmitting said information of the resource to the client (see figure 3; see column 16, lines 49-52; and see column 17, lines 17-21.)

Brownell does not explicitly teach:

parsing information of a resource to identify therein hyperlinks that point to resources behind the firewall;

rewriting the hyperlinks to point to a proxy enabled to access said resources behind the firewall; and

transmitting said information of the resource with the re-written hyperlink.

However, **Smith** teaches a method of preserving referential integrity within web sites (see column 10, lines 9-24), in which he teaches parsing information of a resource to identify therein hyperlinks that point to resources behind the firewall (see column 11, lines 48-63, where “parsing information of a resource” is read on “forwarding a copy of the resource”; and see column 17, lines 10-20); rewriting the hyperlinks to point to a proxy enabled to access said resources behind the firewall (see column 12, lines 57-67, where “rewriting” is read on “updating”; see also column 14, lines 8-17 and column 15, lines 15-22); and transmitting said information of the resource with the re-written hyperlink (see column 13, lines 30-50; and see column 15, lines 23-51.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified **Brownell** by the teachings of **Smith**, because

including the above would enable the user to obtain the desired resource (document) even in the event that the location of the desired document has been changed. The “re-directing” of URLs ensure appropriate search results to the users and while it can remain transparent to the user, it can also serve as means to alert the users that the location of their desired document has been changed. As taught by Smith, depending on the types of redirection (rewriting or updating) of the URLs, “The redirection page contains a URL stub file that automatically redirects the browser to the new URL, without requiring the user to perform any steps. Optionally, the stub file can cause the browser to display a message indicating that “This page has been moved,” along with updating the hyperlink to the new URL. The message can be displayed for a predetermined period of time before loading the page from the new location referenced by the updated URL. In the case of automatic redirection, a user accessing the document on the web site will be unaware that the URL has changed, except that the new URL will replace the previous URL on the location bar in the browser as the new location is being accessed to load the document” (column 13, lines 37-50.)

As to claim 12, Brownell as modified teaches wherein the resource is a Web page (see Brownell, column 7, lines 64-67; and see Smith column 10, lines 9-24, and see “homepage 300” in column 10, line 42.)

Art Unit: 2165

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brownell** in view of **Smith**, as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of **Flynn et al** (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,918 B1, hereinafter referred to as **Flynn**.)

As to claim 13, **Brownell** as modified teaches rewritten hyperlinks (see **Smith**, column 12, lines 57-67, where “rewriting” is read on “updating”; see also column 14, lines 8-17 and column 15, lines 15-22.)

Brownell as modified, still does not explicitly teach wherein the rewritten hyperlinks also comprise security information.

Flynn teaches a method of security for saved web pages (see column 4, lines 64-66), in which he teaches wherein the rewritten hyperlinks also comprise security information (see column 3, lines 37-57; and see column 11, lines 18-40.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified **Brownell** as modified, by the teaching of **Flynn**, because including wherein the rewritten hyperlinks also comprise security information, would enable the system to “re-establish a security context for the saved Web page”, as taught by **Flynn** (column 11, lines 18-40.) For example, if a web page or document is stored with high security due to contents, etc., and later, the page or document is reclassified based on its revised contents, and moved to a server requiring lower security, the re-direction of its URL would contain the lower security information, pointing the user to the server on which the page or document is now stored (or vice versa.)

Art Unit: 2165

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1-10 and 14-22 are allowed over the prior art made of record.
9. Claim 23 would be considered allowable over the prior art made of record provided that the claim is amended to overcome the outstanding rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 (as detailed in paragraphs 3-4 of this Office Action.)

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 13-November-2006 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered, as follows:

Applicant's arguments regarding the 112 rejection for claim 23 has been considered but it is not deemed persuasive. Claims 1 and 23 are both method claims and fall within the same interpretations. Applicant has amended claim 1 to overcome the same rejection. The Examiner maintains the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, for claim 23.

Applicant's amendments to claim 1 has overcome the rejections made to this claim and its dependents, under 35 U.S.C. 101. The rejection is therefore, withdrawn. Applicant's arguments are considered moot at this point.

Applicant argues that claim 11 is a 3-step method claim, none of which is taught by the primary reference, Brownell. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Brownell teaches a method comprising a proxy enabled to access resources behind the firewall (see figure 3, where “proxy” is read on “Tunnel 341) and he teaches transmitting information of the resource to the client (see figure 3; see column 16, lines 49-52; and see column 17, lines 17-21.) What Brownell does not teach is the steps of parsing information of a resource, and rewriting of the hyperlinks which are transmitted to the client, which are both taught by the secondary reference, Smith, as detailed in claim 11 above.

The Applicant further argues that “the words ‘parse’ and ‘firewall’ are not found anywhere in the Smith et al reference.” The Examiner would like to point out that Smith, in column 11, lines 48-63, teaches “forwarding a copy of the resource”, which the Examiner equates to the claim limitation of, “parsing information of a resource”. Also, Smith, throughout his invention talks about “security”, which is the function of a “firewall”, even if the reference does not explicitly refer to a “firewall”. For example, column 5, line 46 through column 6, line 11 of Smith states:

“For security reasons, a Web server machine may limit access to files.
To control access to files on the Web server, the Web server program running on the server machine may provide an extra layer of security above and beyond the normal file system and login security procedures of the operating system on the server machine. The Web server program may add further security rules such as:
(a) optionally requiring input of a user name and password, completely independent of the normal user name and passwords that the operating system may maintain on user accounts; (b) allowing groups of users to be identified for security purposes, independent of any user group definitions defined in the security components of the operating system; (c) access control for each

document object such that only specified users (with optional passwords) or groups of users are allowed access to an object, or so that access is only allowed for clients at specific network addresses, or some combination of these rules; (d) allowing access to the document objects only through a specified subset of the possible HTTP methods; and (e) allowing some document objects to be marked as HTML documents, others to be marked as executable scripts that will generate HTML documents, and others to be marked as other types of objects such as images. Access to the on-line service document objects via a network file system would not conform to the security features of the Web server program and would provide a way to access documents outside of the security provided by the Web server. The Web server program also typically maps document object names that are known to the client to file names on the server file system. This mapping may be arbitrarily complex, and any author or program that tries to access documents on the Web server directly would need to understand this name mapping."

Applicant's remaining arguments are fully considered but they are moot in view of the indication of "Allowable subject matter" in independent claim 1 and 23 (including their dependent claims, where applicable.)

Conclusion

11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory

Art Unit: 2165


period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4078. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached at (571) 272-4146.

tm

December 27, 2006


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100